

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

BERNARD CAMPBELL	:	MISCELLANEOUS ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	No. 07-mc-10
EDWARD G. RENDELL	:	

**ORDER-MEMORANDUM**

AND NOW, this 25<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2007, the papers filed by plaintiff Bernard Campbell, pro se, styled “Declaration of Information; Felonies, High Crimes & Misdemeanors; Demand Resolution of Dispute in Commercial Court,” are dismissed without prejudice to plaintiff’s filing a complaint complying with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, setting forth the jurisdiction of this court and the basis for the claim, on or before Friday, February 9, 2007.

Plaintiff’s “Declaration,” read very liberally,<sup>1</sup> states that on November 20, 2006, he mailed to defendant, Governor Edward G. Rendell, a “Commercial Affidavit”<sup>2</sup> to which the Governor did not respond, thereby placing the Governor in “Contractual Default” with respect to the contents of the “Commercial Affidavit.” Though the specific contents of the “Commercial Affidavit” are not clearly set forth in plaintiff’s “Declaration,” plaintiff appears to contend that he is the victim of various crimes perpetrated by the Governor that somehow

---

<sup>1</sup> A plaintiff’s pro se submission should be construed liberally. Rewolinski v. Morgan, 896 F. Supp. 879, 880 (E.D. Wis. 1995), citing Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972).

<sup>2</sup> A copy of the “Commercial Affidavit” is not attached to plaintiff’s pleading.

are related to plaintiff's parental rights.<sup>3</sup>

These allegations are insufficient to state a claim for relief.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Edmund V. Ludwig  
Edmund V. Ludwig, J.

---

<sup>3</sup> The "Declaration" states, at various points: Plaintiff was "DENIED A RIGHT to due process of law. Such denials include but are not limited to the right to have a intetest [sic] in the custody and welfare . . . ." (Page 3) It is a 'taking action' denying the right to person [sic] property, parental right, privacy right, marriage, and family rights." (Page 4) "This individual (Edward G. Rendell) have [sic] acted with malfeasance of office in conspiracy with Agents of the [Philadelphia Department of Human Services]." (Page 4) "[Edward G. Rendell], specifically and willfully conspired with employees of the City of Philadelphia Department of Human Services to deny Bernard Campbell the rights of due process of law for failing to take action regarding the plight of his son." (Page 5)